Remarks

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated January 31, 2006 is respectfully requested. Claims 1-29 are currently pending and have been rejected.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-17, 19-24, 27, and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,539,393 issued to Kabala (hereinafter "Kabala"). Claims 5 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kabala in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,452 issued to Nishino (hereinafter "Nishino"). Claims 12, 25, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kabala in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,414,635 issued to Stewart et al. (hereinafter "Stewart"). Claim 29 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kabala in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0164983 by Raviv et al. (hereinafter "Raviv"), and further in view of Stewart.

1. Claims 1, 7 and their dependents

Claim 1 recites a wireless transceiver device which interfaces with a roaming device, and includes computer code for causing static input information associated with the wireless transceiver device to be accepted and stored in an editable field of a memory. The wireless transceiver device also includes computer code for causing a record associated with the roaming device to be generated that includes the static input information. The record that includes the static input information is stored on the memory.

Contrary to the Examiner's arguments, it is respectfully submitted that Kabala does not teach the wireless transceiver device of claim 1. Claim 1 recites computer code for causing static input information associated with the wireless transceiver device to be accepted, *i.e.*, by the

wireless transceiver device. The Examiner argues on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action dated January 31, 2006 that Kabala discloses computer code for causing static information associated with the wireless transceiver device to be accepted at lines 52-67 of column 4. This passage of Kabala reads as follows:

> "…each booth receives the identification code of the badge carried by the attendee. The identification information, along with the transceivers' own identification codes, and the signal strength of the signals received from the badges, are forwarded by the transceivers to the central processor…Then, the central processor retrieves the information entered by operators when the attendees registered for the show to archive a list having identity of the attendees, the places of booths visited, the times of the visits, and the durations of the visits."

It is noted that forwarding identifications codes of a transceiver to a central processor is not the same as a transceiver accepting static input information associated with the transceiver. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least this reason.

Further, claim 1 recites computer code for causing a record associated with a roaming device to be generated such that the record includes the static input information associated with the wireless transceiver device. The Examiner has cited FIG. 5 of Kabala, and its associated descriptions, as teaching of this limitation. It is noted that the Examiner seems to have indicated that "transceivers' own identification codes, and the signal strength of signals received from the badges" as recited at lines 52-67 of column 4 of Kabala, are static input information. Though the Applicant does not agree that the transceivers' own identification codes or the signal strength of Kabala are equivalent to static input information associated with the wireless transceiver device that is accepted, it is respectfully submitted that according to the Examiner's logic, the transceivers' own identification codes would have to be included in a record. The so-called "record" shown in FIG. 5 of Kabala does not appear to include any static input information associated with a transceiver, and also fails to include the transceivers' own identification codes.

At lines 3-17 of column 9, Kabala describes FIG. 5. There is no teaching or suggestion that the listing of data described by Kabala includes static input information associated with a

wireless transceiver device. The Applicant submits that the Examiner has argued that transceivers' own identification codes and a signal strength of signals received from badges are static input information associated with a wireless transceiver. As neither of the identification codes nor the signal strength are disclosed as being included in a listing, claim 1 is also believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least this additional reason as well.

Although the Examiner argues that a central processor would have memory to store collected data, there is no teaching in Kabala that the listing of FIG. 5 is stored in memory, particularly memory that includes an editable field that stores static input information.

Claims 2-6 each depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and are each also believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1. Each of these dependent claims recites additional limitations which, when considered in light of claim 1, are believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record. By way of example, claim 5 recites that static input information is a location associated with a wireless transceiver device. The Examiner has acknowledged that Kabala fails to disclose this limitation, but has argued that Nishino overcomes this deficiency of Kabala. Step S212 of FIG. 5 reads "manually input access point," which is disclosed as meaning that a **telephone number of a desired access point is inputted into a communication record table of the terminal** (Nishino, column 15 at lines 5-10). Inputting a telephone number of one device (an access point) into another device (a wireless information processing terminal) is not equivalent to entering a location associated with a device into itself, as required in claim 5. Nishino does not teach or suggest entering a location of a wireless information processing terminal into itself, or even a location of an access point into itself. A terminal that accepts a telephone number associated with an access point cannot be said to be equivalent to a wireless transceiver device that accepts a location associated with itself. As such, claim 5 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least this additional reason as well.

Independent claim 7 recites similar limitations as recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 7 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Each of claims 8-16, which depend from claim 7, are believed to

be allowable over the cited art for at least the same reasons for which claim 7 is allowable. Each of these dependent claims recites additional limitations, which when considered in light of claim 7, are believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record.

2. Claim 17 and its dependents

Independent claim 17 recites a method for utilizing a wireless transceiver device that includes similar limitations to those recited in independent claim 1. As such, claim 17 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Claims 18-23 each depend from claim 17. Therefore, each of claims 18-23 is also believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

3. Claim 24 and its dependents

Claim 24 recites a method of configuring an access point which includes positioning the access point at a desired location, determining an address of the desired location at which the access point is positioned, and storing the address of the desired location of the access point in a memory field associated with the access point. That is, an address of a desired location of an access point is stored in the access point.

On pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action dated January 31, 2006, the Examiner has argued that Kabala discloses the limitations of claim 24. In his arguments, the Examiner appears to state that elements 181-184 of FIG. 1A of Kabala are access points that are positioned at desired locations, and that determining an address of a desired location has something to do with "the transceivers' own ID." At lines 40-50 of column 5, Kabala discloses that transceivers 181-184 are disposed in respective booths, but does not teach of or even reasonably suggest determining addresses of the desired locations at which the transceivers are positioned. "Transceivers' own identification codes," as disclosed at lines 55-57 of column 4 of Kabala, are not taught as being

addresses of desired locations for the transceivers. There is no suggestion in Kabala of determining desired locations for transceivers 181-184, and then determining addresses of the desired locations. Therefore, claim 24 is believed to be allowable over Kabala for at least the reasons set forth.

Claim 24 also recites storing the address of the desired location of the access point in a memory field associated with the access point. It is respectfully submitted that Kabala does not teach of or suggest storing an address of a desired location of a transceiver 181-184 in a memory field associated with the transceiver 181-184. The passage of Kabala cited by the Examiner (lines 58-62 of column 5) read as follows:

> "Transceivers 181 to 184 and 190 and 192 wirelessly transmit, preferably in RF, message packets including data relating to ID codes received from badges, signal strengths, and its own ID to a nearby wired transceiver module 171, 172 or 173....."

As previously mentioned, an ID of a transceiver is not disclosed as being an address of a desired location for a transceiver. Further, there is no suggestion that the address of a desired location for a transceiver is stored in the transceiver. Accordingly, claim 24 is believed to be allowable over Kabala for at least this reason as well.

Claims 25-28 each depend from claim 24. Therefore, each of these claims is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons indicated above with respect to claim 24. Each of these claims is believed to recite additional limitations which, when considered in light of claim 24, are believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record.

5. Claim 29

Claim 29 recites a method for utilizing an access point which includes receiving static information pertaining to the access point into an editable field stored in a memory of the access point, and storing the static information into the editable field. An indication that a roaming

device is within a communications ranged is received, and remote authentication is used to register the roaming device after the indication is received. A record is created after the roaming device is registered with information associated with the roaming device. Finally, the method includes obtaining the static information from the editable field, adding the static information into the record, and storing the record in the memory of the access point.

The Examiner has rejected claim 29 as being unpatentable over Kabala in view of Raviv and further in view of Stewart. As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 17, Kabala does not teach of receiving static information pertaining to an access point or a transceiver into an editable field of the access point or the transceiver, and also does not teach of creating a record to include information associated with a roaming device and the static information. Raviv and Stewart do not overcome these deficiencies of Kabala. Accordingly, claim 29 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least these reasons.

The Examiner has acknowledged on page 10 of the Office Action dated January 31, 2006 that Kabala does not disclose registering a roaming device by performing a remote authentication. However, the Examiner has argued that at paragraph [0254], Raviv discloses this limitation. In paragraph [0254], Raviv discloses that some data services require device authorization before access by a mobile device is permitted, and also makes mention of mobile device authentication. However, Raviv appears to disclose that a mobile device's home network is used to identify the mobile device when authentication of the mobile device is requested. It is respectfully submitted that Raviv does not appear to teach of an access point performing remote authentication to register a roaming device when the roaming device is within a communications range of the access point. Stewart does not overcome this deficiency of Raviv. Therefore, claim 29 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least this additional reason as well.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicant believes all the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone

conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (408) 868-4096.

Respectfully submitted,

Aka Chan LLP

/Peggy A. Su/

Peggy A. Su
Reg. No. 41,336

Aka Chan LLP
900 Lafayette Street, Suite 710
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel: (408) 868-4096
Fax: (408) 608-1599
E-mail: peggy@akachanlaw.com